

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/004,131	MATSUNAMI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eron J. Sorrell	2182	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Eron J. Sorrell. (3) _____.

(2) George Yee (Reg. No. 37,478). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 November 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 6.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Patent No. 6,460,113 yo Schubert et al..

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner and applicant agreed that the servers disclosed by Schubert are not the same as a disk array controller as would be understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art, however a claim limitation was present indicating that one of the controllers was a server. The Examiner and applicant agreed that amending the claims removing the limitation that the one controllers is a server would be more consistent with the figures of the instant application and would overcome the rejection based on Schubert. Examiner informed applicant the amendment would require further search and consideration..